

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

APL CO. PTE., LTD. and AMERICAN	)	Case No. 10-2253 SC
PRESIDENT LINES, LTD.,	)	
	)	ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR
Plaintiffs,	)	<u>DEFAULT JUDGMENT</u>
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
J.R.J. ENTERPRISES, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

---

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Plaintiffs APL Co. Pte., Ltd. and American President Lines, Ltd. (collectively, "Plaintiffs") seek entry of Default Judgment against Defendant J.R.J. Enterprises, Inc. ("Defendant"). ECF No. 10 ("Mot."). Plaintiffs allege Defendant breached a service contract by failing to meet minimum cargo commitments. See Docket No. 1 ("Compl."), ¶¶ 6-26. Having considered the papers submitted, the Court concludes that entry of Default Judgment against Defendant is appropriate, and GRANTS Plaintiffs' Motion.

**II. BACKGROUND**

Plaintiffs are ocean carriers of goods for hire between international ports. Compl. ¶ 6. American President Lines, Ltd. is a Delaware corporation moving cargo to and from the People's

1 Republic of China, Japan, Taiwan, and Mexico; APL Co. Pte., Ltd. is  
2 an affiliated Singapore corporation moving cargo to and from other  
3 locations. See Vargas Decl. Ex. A ("Contract No. LA05/0233")  
4 § 1(d).<sup>1</sup> On or about November 18, 2005, Plaintiffs entered into a  
5 written service contract with Defendant in which Plaintiffs agreed  
6 to transport Defendant's cargo from Columbia and Ecuador to the  
7 United States. Id. App. E. The contract contained a Minimum  
8 Volume Commitment ("MVC") requiring Defendant to tender a minimum  
9 of fifty "freight equivalent units" ("FEUs") during the contract  
10 term. Compl. ¶¶ 8-9; Contract No. LA05/0233 § 2(b), App. E § 4.  
11 The contract also included a liquidated damages or "dead freight"  
12 provision, requiring Defendant to pay "deadfreight in the amount of  
13 \$350 for each FEU by which the MVC . . . exceeds the volume  
14 actually tendered." Compl. ¶ 10; Contract No. LA05/0233 §§ 3(b),  
15 6(b). The contract also includes a clause stating that "[t]he  
16 costs and expenses of . . . litigation (including reasonable  
17 attorney's fees and costs) shall be borne by the non-prevailing  
18 party." Contract LA05/0233 § 4(a).

19 Plaintiffs allege that Defendant tendered only fourteen FEUs  
20 of cargo to Plaintiffs - thirty six fewer FEUs than the MVC -- thus  
21 obligating Defendant to pay Plaintiffs liquidated damages of  
22 \$12,600. Compl. ¶ 12; Vargas Decl. ¶ 6. Plaintiffs invoiced  
23 Defendant for \$12,600, see Vargas Decl., Ex. B ("Invoice"), but  
24 Defendant failed to pay. Compl. ¶¶ 13-14; Vargas Decl. ¶¶ 7-8.  
25 Plaintiffs' Complaint was filed on May 25, 2010. See Compl. The  
26

---

27 <sup>1</sup> Jose Alonso Vargas ("Vargas"), a financial analyst in Plaintiffs'  
28 accounts receivable and collections department, filed a declaration  
in support of the Motion. ECF No. 11.

1 Clerk of the Court entered Default against Defendant on August 31,  
2 2010. Docket No. 15. Plaintiffs seek a Default Judgment of  
3 \$12,950, the amount owed under the terms of the contract plus \$350  
4 for the costs of suit.

5  
6 **III. LEGAL STANDARD**

7 After entry of a default, the Court may enter a default  
8 judgment. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(b)(2). Its decision whether to do  
9 so, while "discretionary," Aldabe v. Aldabe, 616 F.2d 1089, 1092  
10 (9th Cir. 1980), is guided by several factors. As a preliminary  
11 matter, the Court must "assess the adequacy of the service of  
12 process on the party against whom default is requested." Bd. of  
13 Trs. of the N. Cal. Sheet Metal Workers v. Peters, No. 00-0395,  
14 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19065, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 2, 2001). If  
15 the Court determines that service was sufficient, it may consider  
16 the following factors in its decision on the merits of a motion for  
17 default judgment:

18 (1) the possibility of prejudice to the  
19 plaintiff, (2) the merits of plaintiff's  
20 substantive claim, (3) the sufficiency of the  
21 complaint, (4) the sum of money at stake in the  
22 action; (5) the possibility of a dispute  
23 concerning material facts; (6) whether the  
24 default was due to excusable neglect, and (7)  
25 the strong policy underlying the Federal Rules  
26 of Civil Procedure favoring decisions on the  
27 merits.

28 Eitel v. McCool, 782 F.2d 1470, 1471-72 (9th Cir. 1986).

///

///

///

1 **IV. DISCUSSION**

2 **A. Service of Process**

3 Defendant is a corporation. Compl. ¶ 5. Accordingly, service  
4 of process is governed by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(h).  
5 Under Rule 4(h), a corporation may be served "by delivering a copy  
6 of the summons and of the complaint to an officer, a managing or  
7 general agent, or any other agent authorized by appointment or by  
8 law to receive service of process." Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(h)(1)(B).  
9 On June 7, 2010, a registered New Jersey process server served the  
10 Summons and Complaint on Jimmy Machuca, the President of J.R.J.  
11 Enterprises, Inc., at Defendant's corporate offices in Fairlawn,  
12 New Jersey. See Docket No. 5 ("Proof of Service"); deLangis Decl.  
13 ¶ 3.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, the Court finds service of process on Defendant  
14 to be proper.

15 **B. Default Judgment**

16 "The general rule of law is that upon default the factual  
17 allegations of the complaint, except those relating to the amount  
18 of damages, will be taken as true." Geddes v. United Fin. Group,  
19 559 F.2d 557, 560 (9th Cir. 1977). Accepting the allegations in  
20 the Complaint as true, as it must, the Court finds that the Eitel  
21 factors favor default judgment.

22 Plaintiffs would be prejudiced absent entry of default  
23 judgment. Defendant's failure to meet the contractually obligated  
24 MVC triggered the liquidated damages provision in the contract.  
25 Plaintiffs would be left without a legal remedy if it were denied  
26 an entry of default judgment.

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>2</sup> Mark K. deLangis ("deLangis"), counsel for Plaintiffs, filed a  
declaration in support of the Motion. Docket No. 12.

1 Plaintiffs have properly alleged the necessary elements for  
2 their causes of action. Plaintiffs and Defendant entered into a  
3 facially valid contract; Defendant failed to meet the MVC,  
4 triggering the liquidated damages provisions. The Complaint  
5 identifies the contract at issue, how it was breached (failure to  
6 meet the MVC of fifty FEUs), and the appropriate remedy (liquidated  
7 damages of \$350 for each FEU by which the MVC exceeds the volume  
8 actually tendered). The liquidated damages provisions of \$350 per  
9 FEU are not so unreasonable as to render the contracts  
10 unenforceable. See Cal. Civ. Code § 1671(b) ("a provision in a  
11 contract liquidating the damages for the breach of the contract is  
12 valid unless the party seeking to invalidate the provision  
13 establishes that the provision was unreasonable under the  
14 circumstances existing at the time the contract was made").<sup>3</sup>  
15 Accordingly, Plaintiffs' Complaint is sufficient.

16 The amount of money at stake in this action -- \$12,600 plus  
17 \$350 in litigation costs -- is not so great as to preclude default  
18 judgment. The amount at issue is also unambiguous and easily  
19 calculable in light of the relevant contract provisions.

20 There is some potential for a dispute concerning material  
21 facts in this action; in particular, whether Defendant failed to  
22 meet its MVC of fifty FEUs. However, Vargas declares, under  
23 penalty of perjury, that Defendant failed to tender the required  
24 number of FEUs. Vargas Decl. ¶ 6. Thus this factor favors default  
25 judgment.

---

26 <sup>3</sup> Maritime contract actions are governed by state law, provided  
27 state law does not clearly conflict with federal maritime law. See  
28 Aqua-Marine Constructors, Inc. v. Banks, 110 F.3d 663, 667-68 (9th  
Cir. 1997).

1 In addition, no facts suggest Defendant's failure to  
2 participate in this action was due to excusable neglect. Defendant  
3 was served with notice of the present action, see Proof of Service,  
4 and did not participate. deLangis Decl. ¶ 4. This factor favors  
5 entry of default judgment. Finally, while it is preferable to  
6 decide cases on the merits whenever possible, Rule 55(b) allows  
7 entry of default judgment in situations such as this, where  
8 Defendants have failed to litigate.

9 **C. Remedy**

10 Plaintiffs request liquidated damages of \$12,600 plus \$350 in  
11 costs. The Court finds that Plaintiffs' calculation of liquidated  
12 damages to be reasonable and correct in light of the facts alleged  
13 and the terms of the contract. The contract also provides for  
14 litigation costs to be paid by the non-prevailing party. Contract  
15 No. LA05/0233 § 4(a). The Court finds the \$350 sought is  
16 reasonable given the \$350 filing fee imposed by 28 U.S.C. §  
17 1914(a).

18  
19 **V. CONCLUSION**

20 The Court GRANTS the Motion for Default Judgment filed by  
21 Plaintiffs APL Co. Pte., Ltd. and American President Lines, Ltd.,  
22 in the amount of \$12,950.

23  
24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25  
26 Dated: September 24, 2010

27   
28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE